ED 022 405

FL 000 988

By-Kyes, Robert L. Ed.

THE PERFORMANCE OF CEEB STUDENTS IN GERMAN 101, 102, 231, AND 232 IN THE FALL TERM, 1967.

Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Dept. of Foreign Languages.

Pub Date May 68

Note-5p.

Journal Cit-The Foreign Language Courier; n40 p19-23 May 1968

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.28

Descriptors-ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, \*COLLEGE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, \*GERMAN, \*GRADES (SCHOLASTIC),

STANDARDIZED TESTS, \*STUDENT PLACEMENT, STUDENT TESTING, \*TABLES (DATA), TEST RESULTS

Identifiers-CEEB Scores

Statistics from a study conducted in the University of Michigan's Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures are presented in tabular form under these headings: placement scale, numbers of students placed, numbers of students enrolled, previous German versus placement, grades received, and performance of CEEB students (by course). (AF)



## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF ELLICATION POSITION OR POLICY.

#### THE PERFORMANCE OF CEEB STUDENTS IN GERMAN 101, 102, 231, AND 232 IN THE FALL TERM, 1967

1. Placement scale. The CEEB scores for placement into German 101-232 for the fall term, 1967, were as follows:

IUI-	BOD TOL WIC THEFT OF	, · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
5		Reading	Listening
<b>♦</b>	101	0-424	0-424
N	231 232	425-549 550-599	425-499 500-599
N	Met Req.	<b>600</b> +	<b>600</b> +

### Numbers of students placed.

Course	1967	(%)	1966	(%)	1965	(%)	1964	(%)
101	194	36	221	<b>52</b>	110	<b>26</b>	123	28
231	179	34	100	24	214	<b>50</b>	<b>225</b>	51
232	94	18	<b>57</b>	13	86	20	71	16
Met Req.	62	12	48	11	18	4	<u>20</u>	_5
•	<b>529</b>	$1\overline{00}$	<b>426</b>	100	<b>428</b>	100	439	$1\overline{00}$

No students were placed into German 102 on the basis of CEEB scores alone. Twelve students, however, were allowed to transfer from 101 to 102 early in the term. Their scores were relatively high in the 101 range, and most of them were in 101 without credit. Several additional students were invited to switch to 102, but declined.

The 1967 placement into 101 is lower than that of 1966, and the 1967 placement into 231 is higher than that of 1966. This shift in proportion was the predicted result of having lowered the minimum scores for placement into 231. The minimum reading score was lowered from 476 to 425, and the listening score from 451 to 425.

200 75

3. Numbers of students enrolled. Of the 529 students who took the CEEB German test, 467 were placed into German 101-232. The remaining 62 either took no German, or enrolled in a 300-level course. Of these 467, only 263 (56.6%) actually finished a German course. In 1966 the number of students who took the test was 426; 378 were placed into 101-232, and 280 (74.1%) finished. The greatest rate of attrition took place in 101, as may be seen in the following figures for 1967:

Course	Students placed (%)	4th <u>week</u> (%)	End of term (%)
101	194 41.6	114 35.9	89 33.8
102		<b>12 3.8</b>	11 <b>4.2</b>
<b>231</b>	179 38.3	127 40.1	107 40.7
232	94 20.1	64 20.2	56 <b>21.3</b>
	$\overline{467} \ 1\overline{00.0}$	$\overline{317} 1\overline{00.0}$	$\overline{263} \ 1\overline{00.0}$

4. Previous German vs. placement. This table includes only those students who took the CEEB test and actually finished the course.

Course	•	2 years hi schl	3 years hi schl	4 years hi schl	Other	Tota	us (%)
101	34	46	3		6	89	33.8
<b>102</b>		8	2	1		11	4.2
<b>23</b> 1		53	38	7	9	107	40.7
232	1	6	24	20	5	<b>56</b>	21.3
	35	$1\overline{\overline{13}}$	<b>67</b>	<b>28</b>	20	<b>263</b>	100.0

Students represented by numbers above the dotted lines did not receive graduation credit for their course.

In addition to the 89 students in 101 indicated here, there were 14 others who had previous training in German, but are not included in these figures. 10 failed to take the CEEB test, but for various reasons were allowed to enroll in 101 anyway. One was in the Residential College and should have been in a higher course, but was sent back to 101 by her adviser. 2 enrolled as visitors. One, though a fairly fluent speaker of German, was illiterate in German and was therefore allowed to enroll in 101. There were 9 students in 231 who had had German at other schools but did not take the CEEB test, and 7 such students in 232; none of these are included in these figures.

"Other" includes transfer students, students who learned German on their own, etc.

5. Grades received. The table below represents all students enrolled in German 101-232 in the fall term of 1967.

Grade	101 (%)	102 (%)	<b>231(%)</b>	<u>232</u> (%)
	98 17.5	13 10.7	57 12.2	17 12.2
A B	162 28.9	18 14.9	<b>135 28.8</b>	44 31.7
Č	159 28.4	48 39.7	1 <b>90 40.</b> 6 56 <b>12.0</b>	54 <b>3</b> 8.8 17 12.2
D	81 14.5	26 21.5 11 9.1	56 12.0 22 4.7	4 2.9
E	34 6.1 26 4.6	5 4.1	8 1.7	3 2.2
'X'	560 1 <b>00.0</b>	121 100.0	468 100.0	$\overline{139} \ 1\overline{00.0}$

An 'X' indicates simply that a student was absent from the final examination.

6. Performance of CEEB students. Figures in the tables below represent CEEB students with 1,2,3, or 4 years of German in high school. The results for the non-CEEB students are given on the right for comparison. Grades of 'X' are not shown separately (8 CEEB students received 'X' as against 34 non-CEEB students).

"Non-CEEB students" includes several categories: those with no previous German at the U. of M.; repeaters; 26 students who had German before but did not take the CEEB test; and 2 who were originally placed into higher courses but switched back.

#### German 101

Enrollment in 101 at end of term: 560 CEEB students in 101 at end of term: 89 (15.9% of total)

Grade	<u>1 yr.</u>	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	Other	Tot	Total (%)		Non-CEEB students (%)		
A B C D	10 12 8 2	5 20 15 4	2 1	1 3 2	16 37 26 6 4	18.0 41.6 29.2 6.8 4.4	82 125 133 75 30	18.4 28.1 29.9 16.9 6.7		
E	$\frac{2}{34}$	$\frac{2}{46}$	3	6	<del>89</del>	$1\overline{00.0}$	455	$1\overline{00.0}$		



German 102

Enrollment in 102 at end of term: 121

CEEB students in 102 at end of term: 11 (9.1%)

Grade	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	Other Total (%)		al (%)	Non-CEEB students (%)			
A	1		1	2	18.2	11	<b>10.</b> 5		
В	3			3	<b>27.3</b>	15	14.3		
$\ddot{\mathbf{c}}$	2	2		4	36.3	44	41.9		
Ď	1			1	9.1	25	23.8		
Ē	1			1	9.1	10	9.5		
	8	$\overline{2}$	1	11	$1\overline{00.0}$	$1\overline{05}$	100.0		

German 231

Enrollment in 231 at end of term: 468

CEEB students in 231 at end of term: 107 (22.9%)

Grade	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	4 yrs.	Other	Total (%)		Non-CEEB students (%)		
A	6	4	1	1	12	11.2	45	12.7	
В	19	11	2	1	33	<b>30.</b> 8	102	28.9	
Ċ	23	16	3	7	49	45.8	141	39.9	
Ď	2	3	1		6	5 <b>.6</b>	5 <b>0</b>	14.2	
Ē	3	4			7	6.6	15	4.3	
	53	38	7	9	107	100.0	<b>353</b>	100.0	

Lowering the minimum scores for placement into 231 allowed 52 students into 231 who otherwise would have been placed into 101. Their grades were as follows:

Grade	Low	CEEB(%)	Others(%)			
A	<del></del> 5	9.6	52	12.5		
В	15	28.8	120	28.9		
С	23	44.2	167	40.2		
D	3	5.8	5 <b>3</b>	12.7		
E	4	7.7	18	4.3		
'X'	2	3.9	6	1.4		
	52	100.0	$\overline{416}$	100.0		

This distribution of grades shows that, in terms of results, the low scorers were not at a particular disadvantage relative to the other 231-students.





Enrollment in 232 at end of term: 139

CEEB students enrolled in 232 at end of term: 56 (40.3%)

Grade	1 yr.	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	4 yr '.	Other	Tota	al(%)		ceeb nts(%)
A		3	3	1	1	8	14.3	9	11.2
В		3	8	8	2	21	37.5	<b>23</b>	28.8
C	1	•	11	8	2	22	39.3	<b>32</b>	40.0
_	1		2	3	_	5	8.9	12	<b>15.0</b>
Ð				•				4	5.0
E	1	$\overline{6}$	$\overline{24}$	20	5	<del>56</del>	100.0	80	100.0

Robert L. Kyes The University of Michigan

## The

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Published by

COURIER

The Departments of Foreign Languages University of Michigan

in cooperation with the FL program of the MLA

Editor for this Issue:

Robert L. Kyes, Department of

Germanic Languages and Literatures,

in association with

Howard Cameron, Classical Studies Howard Dwelley, Slavic Languages and Literatures Michio Hagiwara, Romance Languages and Literatures Erwin Hamson, Language Labo. atory Ernest McCarus, Near Eastern Languages and Literatures William Merhab, School of Education Susumu Nagara, Far Eastern Languages and Literatures David Wolfe, Romance Languages and Literatures

No. 40

May, 1968

